

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/937,306 09/20/2001		Michel Auguet	427-047	8402	
7590 12/01/2003			EXAMINER		
Bierman Muserlian and Lucas			MELLER, MICHAEL V		
600 Third Avenue New York, NY 10016			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	.00.0		1654		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/937,30	6	AUGUET ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Michael V.	Meller	1654			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the	cover sheet with the c	rrespondence address			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. If SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repulse of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period under the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statular reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no eve ply within the statu d will apply and wil te, cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) days I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cation to become ABANDONET	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 185	September 2	<u>003</u> .				
·	<u> </u>	s action is no	-				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	tion of Claims						
4)🖾	B)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-12 and 25-36</u> is/are pending in the application.						
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>25-36</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1, 4-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election re	quirement.				
Applicat	tion Papers						
9)[9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)[))☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. No	te the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
-	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
* (13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat See the attached detailed Office action for a list Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestince a specific reference was included in the first Terminal Translation of the foreign language processing the process of the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority of the foreign language processing the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for domesting the priority document is made of a claim for document is made of a cl	nts have beer ority docume au (PCT Rule of the certific priority unirst sentence rovisional appetic priority un	n received. In received in Application received in Application that have been received at 17.2(a)). It is ideal to the copies not received der 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) of the specification or oblication has been received der 35 U.S.C. §§ 120.	on No d in this National Stage d.) (to a provisional application) in an Application Data Sheet. eived. and/or 121 since a specific			
Attachmer			F7				
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·		PTO-413) Paper No(s) stent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/937,306

Art Unit: 1654

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1, 2, 4-12 and lipoic acid and

N-phenyl-2-thiophenecarboximidamine in Paper No. 2 is acknowledged. The traversal

is on the ground(s) that groups I and III are drawn to a special technical feature in the

fact that they are pharmaceutical compositions having the dual activity of inhibiting NO

synthase and antioxidant activity and group III is a method of using that composition.

This is not found persuasive because as stated in the previous office action the different

groups do not share a special technical feature since the composition is both anticipated

and obvious over the cited references of record.

Claims 25-36 stand withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner as

being drawn to non-elected subject matter.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 09/937,306

Art Unit: 1654

Claims 1, 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Naftchi et al. '933 or '962.

Applicant argues that the patents disclose a single compound with both ingredients whereas applicant allegedly claim a mixture of two separate ingredients. As is clearly shown at the cited portions of the patents, they teach both ingredients together (lipoic acid and aminoguanidine). The claims claim a composition consisting essentially of a NO synthase inhibitory substance and a metabolic antioxidant substance which the two references teach.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naftchi et al. '933, Naftchi et al. '962, Petrus or Lai.

The teachings and arguments of the Naftchi references are discussed above. Applicant argues that Petrus uses an aminosugar and therefore cannot teach the claimed invention because the claimed invention uses the language, "consisting essentially of". The composition can be administered in oral form, thus one could administer the composition in a glass of orange juice which would have vitamin C in it. Thus, Vitamin C in this instance is another ingredient which could read on "consisting essentially of".

Application/Control Number: 09/937,306

Art Unit: 1654

In response to the language "consisting essentially of" in the claim, applicant is reminded of MPEP 2111.03:

For the purposes of searching for and applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g., PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355 ("PPG could have defined the scope of the phrase consisting essentially of' for purposes of its patent by making clear in its specification what it regarded as constituting a material change in the basic and novel characteristics of the invention."). See also In re Janakirama-Rao, 317 F.2d 951, 954, 137 USPQ 893, 895-96 (CCPA 1963). If an applicant contends that additional steps or materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of," applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the characteristics of applicant's invention. In re De Lajarte, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). See also Ex parte Hoffman, 12 USPQ2d 1061, 1063-64 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989) ("Although consisting essentially of is typically used and defined in the context of compositions of matter, we find nothing intrinsically wrong with the use of such language as a modifier of method steps. . . [rendering] the claim open only for the inclusion of steps which do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed method. To determine the steps included versus excluded the claim must be read in light of the specification. . . . [1]t is an applicant's burden to establish that a step practiced in a prior art method is excluded from his claims by consisting essentially of language.").

Thus, the claimed invention is still obvious over the cited references.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1654

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 703-308-4230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 703-306-3220. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Michael V. Meller Primary Examiner Art Unit 1654